



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,062	04/16/2004	Cecilia Castillo	2002-0427	9972
26652	7590	10/27/2008	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP. ROOM 2A207 ONE AT&T WAY BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921			NEWAY, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,062

Applicant(s)

CASTILLO ET AL.

Examiner

Samuel G. Neway

Art Unit

2626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-856)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is responsive to the RCE filed on 07 July 2008.
2. Claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 32 are pending and considered below.

Response to Amendment

3. The 35 U.S.C 101 rejection of claims 21 – 32 is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 1, the added limitation "outside of a telecommunications network" was not disclosed in the specification as originally filed. Claims 2 – 12 are rejected because they depend upon claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 21, 27, 28, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine et al (US PGPub 2003/0217190) in view of Sinai et al (USPN 7,143,042).

Claim 1:

Devine discloses a method of converting a call flow into a state-based representation (Abstract), the method comprising:

walking a call flow and converting each page of the call flow into a rule of a higher level representation of the call flow ("The drawing package allows for the created flow charts to be saved in an intermediate language format", [0007]), outside of a telecommunication network ("the systems and methods described herein may be employed in many applications besides telephony services, including gaming, video-conferencing, billing, and other applications" ([0067]);

augmenting the higher level representation with terminal symbols representing state variable assignments and comparisons associated with decision and computation shapes in the call flow ("an intermediate language format that captures the physical

description of the graphical representation of the process as well as information representative of the content in that flowchart", [0007]); and

converting the higher level representation into a state-based representation ("A parser processes these intermediate language documents to create a state event table that can direct the operation of a state machine engine", [0007]).

Devine does not explicitly disclose that the flow chart is for a spoken dialog service.

Sinai discloses a similar call flow design tool where the generated flow is from a spoken dialog service ("The function of the dialog runtime unit 42 is to enable the developer to execute a dialog being assembled using the dialog flow editor 41", col. 8, lines 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Devine's flow charts for Sinai's spoken dialog service, or any other process that can be represented by a flow chart, because, as Devine states, "the systems and methods described herein may be employed in many applications besides telephony services, including gaming, video-conferencing, billing, and other applications" ([0067]).

Claim 7:

Devine and Sinai disclose the method of claim 1, Devine further discloses wherein the call flow comprises at least one page having a set of shapes having specific meanings (Fig. 4 and related text).

Claim 8:

Devine and Sinai disclose the method of claim 7, Devine further discloses wherein the set of shapes having special meaning comprises at least: parallelograms representing rules, lines representing dialog inputs, rectangular boxes representing dialog outputs or actions, diamonds representing Boolean decision functions, hexagrams representing calculation and assignment functions and annotation shapes representation comments (Fig. 4 and related text).

Claim 11:

Devine and Sinai disclose the method of claim 1, Devine further discloses wherein the rule comprises terminal symbols comprising the names used to label shapes and transitions of the call flow ("The translator can process these shapes and connectors to develop a set of instructions, such as a set of XML instructions", [0027]).

Claim 12:

Devine and Sinai disclose the method of claim 1, Devine further discloses generating a unique terminal symbol in the higher level representation that shadows each rule, input, output, decision and calculation within the call flow ("The translator can process these shapes and connectors to develop a set of instructions, such as a set of XML instructions, that represent the service presented in the drawing.", [0027]).

Claims 21, 27, 28, 31, and 32:

Systems claims 21, 27, 28, 31, and 32 and method claims 1, 7, 8, 11, and 12 are related as system and the method of using same, with each claimed element's function corresponding to the claimed method step. Accordingly claims 21, 27, 28, 31, and 32

are rejected with the same rationale as applied above with respect to method claims 1, 7, 8, 11, and 12.

9. Claims 2, 3, 5, 22, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine et al (US PGPub 2003/0217190) in view of Sinai et al (USPN 7,143,042) and in further view of Mital et al (USPN 7,184,967).

Claim 2:

Devine and Sinai disclose the method of claim 1, but they do not explicitly disclose wherein the higher level representation is a context-free grammar representation.

In a similar method, Mital discloses converting a workflow into a higher level representation wherein the higher level representation (XML) is defined in a context-free grammar ("Backus-Naur Form", col. 17, lines 15-17, Fig. 24 and related text).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define the higher level representation in Devine's method in a context-free grammar as disclosed in Mital because context-free grammar is a widely used format for specifying the syntax of a language.

Claim 3:

Devine, Sinai and Mital disclose the method of claim 2, Mital further discloses wherein the context free grammar notation is a Backus-Naur Form (BNF) (col. 17, lines 15-17, Fig. 24 and related text).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define the higher level representation in Devine's method in a Backus-Naur Form as disclosed in Mital because Backus-Naur Form is a widely used format for specifying the syntax of a language.

Claim 5:

Devine, Sinai and Mital disclose the method of claim 3, Devine further discloses wherein the step of walking the call flow and converting each page to a BNF occurs automatically via a computing device ("the editor is the Microsoft Visio editor which allows for a created flowchart to be saved an XML format", [0007]).

Claims 22, 23, and 25:

Systems claims 22, 23, and 25 and method claims 2, 3, and 5 are related as system and the method of using same, with each claimed element's function corresponding to the claimed method step. Accordingly claims 22, 23, and 25 are rejected with the same rationale as applied above with respect to method claims 2, 3, and 5.

10. Claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 24, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine et al (US PGPub 2003/0217190) in view of Sinai et al (USPN 7,143,042), in view of Mital et al (USPN 7,184,967), and in further view of Wallace (USPN 4,686,623).

Claim 4:

Devine, Sinai, and Mital disclose the method of claim 3, but they do not explicitly disclose wherein the state-based representation is a finite state machine (FSM).

It is old and well known in the computing arts to input context-free grammar into a grammar parser and generate a finite state machine as evidenced by Wallace which discloses expressing source code in a context-free grammar which is provided to a grammar parser which in turn generates a finite state machine (col. 2, lines 38-44).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the state based representation of Devine's method be finite state machines because they are known and old standards in compiling source code.

Claim 6:

Devine, Sinai, Mital and Wallace disclose the method of claim 4, Devine further discloses wherein the step of augmenting the BNF with terminal symbols occurs automatically via a computing device ("the editor is the Microsoft Visio editor which allows for a created flowchart to be saved an XML format", [0007]).

Claim 9:

Devine, Sinai, Mital and Wallace disclose the method of claim 4, Wallace further discloses wherein a grammar compiler is used to convert the BNF into the FSM (col. 2, lines 38-44).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a grammar compiler to convert BNF into FSM because it is an old and known standard in compiling source code.

Claim 10:

Devine, Sinai, Mital and Wallace disclose the method of claim 9, Sinai further discloses wherein the FSM may be used by at least one spoken dialog tool to perform generation and testing functions associated with a spoken dialog service ("The function of the dialog runtime unit 42 is to enable the developer to execute a dialog being assembled using the dialog flow editor 41, such as for testing and debugging purposes", col. 8, lines 40-43).

Claims 24, 26, 29, and 30:

Systems claims 24, 26, 29, and 30 and method claims 4, 6, 9, and 10 are related as system and the method of using same, with each claimed element's function corresponding to the claimed method step. Accordingly claims 24, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected with the same rationale as applied above with respect to method claims 4, 6, 9, and 10.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/S. G. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2626